progress, the Jews entered whole-heartedly. They found it a starveling newcomer, relegated to back-streets and uncomfortable halls, and occupying itself in cheap extravagances. It was largely under Jewish auspices that it developed from this to a great industry, not challenging but supplementing the theatre ; the centre of a new art which brought a new standard of comfort as well as of achievement to the reach of the poorest pocket. There was a period when the subject-matter (reflecting post-war moral standards) tended to be sordid and sex-centred. If the Jews were associated with this, they were associated no less with the subsequent regeneration, which in recent years has made such remarkable progress. No man, for instance, did more to enhance the dignity of the cinema industry than Irving Thalberg, whose death in 1936 was mourned by critics all over the world as a major disaster.[1]

Much has been said, from the days of Wagner onwards, of the contamination of the pure source of European inspiration by the " alien" element introduced by the Jew. An examination of the facts assembled above shews that this suggestion is in complete variance from the truth. In music, in art, in literature (as, indeed, in science and in medicine) the Jew has brought to bear a keen critical faculty, highly developed through centuries of intensive culture and an innate respect for intellect and intellectual achievement. This is coupled with great

receptivity, a reluctance to accept tradition *per se,* and perhaps a critical aloofness, natural in those whose identity has for centuries been maintained as that of a small minority in a hostile world. Thus there is inherent

[1] The screen has proved a stimulating, if dangerous, rival to the stage. But it was disastrous to the old-type Music Hall, with which Jews were hardly less intimately associated than they are now with the Cinema (See also below, pp. 253-4).